

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application and for indicating that the claims include allowable subject matter. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner objected to typographical errors in the specification at page 3, line 35 and page 5, line 33. Appropriate amendments have been made to the specification.

Claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for including the term "several." Appropriate amendments have been made to claims 3 and 5. Specifically, the term "several" has been deleted from claim 3, and the terms "one or several" have been amended to "one or more" in claim 5.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McIntyre. Claim 1 recites, "a superconducting cable comprising N phases...classifying the phase conductors in N phase groups, each N-phase group comprising a phase conductor from each of the N different phases, where N is greater than one."

Claim 1 is directed to a multiphase cable having "N" phases (e.g., three phases). The cable includes N-phase groups comprising a phase conductor from each of the N different phases. For example, a three-phase cable would have conductors for phases A, B, and C grouped into three-phase groups.

McIntyre does not teach or suggest a multiphase cable. The Office action appears to confuse McIntyre's materials of construction at 11:17-20 with electrical phases. McIntyre teaches that superconducting strands 24 may be fabricated as a conventional superconducting

strand 24a, a silver matrix superconducting strand 24b, and a ribbon superconducting strand 24c. McIntyre does not teach that the superconducting strands 24a, 24b, 24c are separate conductors for different electrical phases. The reference character “24a/b/c” found in the figures merely identifies alternative embodiments, which employ different superconducting strands (i.e., conventional 24a, silver matrix 24b and ribbon 24c.) Reference character “24a/b/c” does not identify different phases of a multiphase cable.

Further, the Office action asserts that McIntyre teaches “classifying the phase conductors in N-phase groups” because “each filament 30 is a different group because it contains each phase conductor Ref. #s 24a, 24b, 24c.” However, it is the superconducting strand 24 which is made up of filaments 30 (11:8-9). The filament 30 is not made up of strands 24, as asserted in the Office action. Therefore, the filament 30 cannot teach the claimed N-phase group. Applicant submits that McIntyre fails to teach a multiphase cable and does not N-phase groups.

Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by McIntyre and that claim 1 is allowable over McIntyre. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10-13 and 15 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, are also allowable over McIntyre. The arguments provided above with respect to claim 1 are also applicable to claim 14.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McIntyre in view of Horvath. Claim 3 depends from claim 1, which recites, “providing the N-phase groups or assemblies of N-phase groups with a common electrically conductive screen.” As discussed above, McIntyre fails to teach or suggest the claimed N-phase groups. Horvath teaches sheaths (46, 47, 48, 72, 73) that consist of a highly resistive material (4:1-3 and 5:1-3). Thus, the sheaths of Horvath are not electrically conductive. Applicant submits that the cited combination of references fails to teach or suggest providing the N-phase groups or assemblies of N-phase

groups with a common electrically conductive screen, as required by claim 3. Therefore, claim 3 is allowable over McIntyre in view of Horvath.

The Examiner objected to claims 7 and 9 for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that claims 7 and 9 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 7 and 9 have been amended and are now written in independent form. Therefore, claims 7 and 9 are allowable.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34155US1.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By:   
Brad C. Spencer, Reg. No. 57076

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 23, 2007